

Appln. No.: 09/391,069
Amdt. dated August 29, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 30, 2003

Remarks/Arguments

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 30, 2003. A Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

Claims 1-47 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-25, and 27-47. Claims 1-47 are now pending.

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 9, 21, and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 15-20, 22-25, and 27-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ohkado* (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,165).

Claims 4 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ohkado* in view of *England* (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,991).

II. Summary of Applicant's Response

Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-25, and 27-47.

III. Response to Objections and Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 15-20, 22-25, and 27-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ohkado* (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,165). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

A system for placing and maintaining anchored conversations within an artifact, comprising:

- an application configured to access the artifact;
- a conversation client configured to access said anchored conversation and to receive communications regarding a portion of the artifact;
- an anchor configured to identify a location within said artifact with which said conversation client is associated; and
- a conversation coordinator configured to maintain a relationship between the anchor, the conversation client and the anchored conversation.

Independent claims 33,35, and 47 recite methods, applications, and means with similar functionality. The claimed invention includes a system for anchoring documents into a conversational application. Users of a shared chat space are able to access user-selected locations of shared documents.

Ohkado, which discloses a system of collaborative image generation programs, does not disclose or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Ohkado does not disclose artifacts within a conversation or mechanisms for accessing said artifacts from communications clients. Rather Ohkado discloses a system for highlighting physical sections of a viewing window so that the sections can be viewed on other systems. The annotations of Ohkado are not associated with artifacts, but rather the physical images that are transmitted, as indicated in col3 ln. 20-24 “a step of sending image data of said application window”.

Additionally Ohkado, does not disclose or suggest “anchored” artifacts wherein locations within an artifact are associated with text conversations. Rather, Ohkado discloses the annotation of images. The approach of Ohkado is distinctly inferior as the disclosed text communications are not associated with

artifacts such as documents, but rather raw images highlighted within a user's desktop. Firstly, Ohkado depends on the capacity of the receiving client to receive raw image files. Additionally, as only visual selections are available, it does not enable shared users to access other parts of the artifact, download a copy of the artifact, or otherwise access the data enclosed within the artifact.

Nor does England, which describes a system and method for managing interactions between users in a browser-based telecommunications network, disclose or suggest the features of the claimed invention. England utilizes a graphical user interface (e.g. Internet Explorer) with frame sets, such as those depicted in Figures 1-5 to allow a "guide" to communicate in real time with a "client" by displaying information to the client through frames of a frame set. Within each frame, a guide may load different collaborative tools to communicate with a client. However, there is no discussion in England of anchoring a conversation client within an artifact, as called for in each of the independent claims.

As neither England nor Ohkado, either alone or in combination, disclose the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application is patently distinguishable under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)

IV. Conclusion

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is


Appln. No.: 09/391,069
Amdt. dated August 29, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 30, 2003

respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 29, 2003

By: 
Bryon T. Wasserman
Reg. No. 48,404

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800